```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                                 │
│                  Course Outcomes Assessment                     │
│                                                                 │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

Course/Program Title: DHY 220 Dental Hygiene Theory IV   Date: 5/18/17
Course/Program Team: Marlaina Lantzy RDH, MS

Expected Learning Outcomes:
1. Discuss preparation skills and application processes for the successful completion of the National Board Dental Hygiene Examination (NBDHE) and the American Dental Hygiene Licensing Examination (ADHLEX) for licensure.
2. Examine the process of preparing for an entry level dental hygiene job, establishing professional affiliations and implementing practice management strategies.
3. Assess oral and systemic healthcare treatment modifications for special needs patients.

Assessment: (How do or will students demonstrate achievement of each outcome? Please attach a copy of your assessment electronically.)

Resume & Cover Letter (50 points each)	100
Private Practice Observation Paper	30
Professional Meeting Reflection Papers (2 @ 15 points each)	30
Portfolio Progress Check	15
Tests (3 @ 50)	150
CDCA & NBDHE Quizzes (2 @ 25)	50
Portfolio	100
Classroom Engagement (3% weighted)	45
Attendance (2% weighted)	45
Total	**565 points**

1. Resume and Cover Letter: Students create original cover letters and resumes which help them prepare for interviews and obtaining employment. These two projects are ~17% of the total course grade.

2. Exams: Three tests are given throughout the semester, which include lecture material, homework, and reading assignments that cover the practice and theory of dental hygiene and prepare student to take the National Dental Hygiene Board Exam (NBDHE). The three exams are ~27% of the total course grade.

3. Portfolio: The Portfolio Project is designed as a comprehensive project that is compiled over a series of drafts during the three semesters of Theory II, III and IV. The Portfolio project is intended to: 1. Serve as an alternative measure of student competency to practice dental hygiene. Students must present an argument for their competency in each of the 7 major Dental Hygiene Program Competencies and provide evidence to support their positon. This project is a compilation of clinical and didactic work completed throughout entire program. 2. Serve as an

organizational career resource for managing licensure and a showcase of accomplishments for potential employers. The final version of this project is ~17% of the total course grade.

Validation: (What methods have you used or will you use to validate your assessment?)

1. Resume and Cover Letter: Students work with the lead instructor to submit drafts and then final versions of each document. The lead instructor evaluates the quality of each document based on a grading rubric and provides written feedback to students. Students are required to include both documents in their Portfolio. **(90% of students achieve an average of 80% or higher on the Cover Letter and Resume)**

2. Exams: Exams are constructed based on current evidence based practices and board exam content. An item analysis is conducted by the lead instructor to validate each exam. **(90% of students achieve an average of 75% or higher on the average of all exams)**

3. Portfolio: During Theory II, III and IV one or two drafts of small sections of the final project are required coursework. The lead instructor grades each draft section with a grading rubric and provides written feedback for improvement. During Theory IV, the final Portfolio Project is evaluated using a grading rubric that is available to students in each of the 3 theory courses as they work towards project completion. **(100% of students achieve a final score of 80% of higher on the final Portfolio submission)**

Results: (What do your assessment data show? If you have not yet assessed student achievement of your learning outcomes, when is assessment planned?)

I have chosen to compare data from the first 2 cohorts to analyze results, second year classes were not offered in Spring 2015.

1. Resume and Cover Letter: Student performance on the Resume was 3% lower than the first cohort and the Cover Letter performance was 32% higher than the first cohort. The large difference in Cover Letter scores may be attributed to 4 out of 17 students in 2016 receiving zeros on the project because they did not submit original work. This point was emphasized in Spring 2017 and all students submitted a cover letter that included original work.   Additionally, The lead faculty made the following changes from Spring 2016 to Spring 2017, which most likely account for the difference in grades: The lecture that taught resumes and cover letters was revised in 2017 and many examples of what to do or not do were posted on Moodle and discussed in class, graded rough drafts of each project were added to Spring 2017 and students were given class time to work on both projects to allow for peer collaboration and immediate instructor feedback.   **(16/18, or 88% of students, scored a 80% or higher on the Cover Letter and Resume)**

2. Exams: Student performance on exams is consistent between the first and second cohorts, with a 3% decrease in exam averages. **(19/19, or 100% of students, achieved a 75% or higher on the average of all three exams. Range of exam averages: 93%-79%)**

3. Portfolio: The Portfolio project was changed drastically after the first cohort; therefore, comparison of scores between the first two cohorts is not meaningful due to the difference in required work. Changes to the project for Spring 2017 included revised grading rubrics for each draft and the final product, a decrease in required content in order to allow student to focus more on the quality of the work produced and a greater number of smaller drafts being required before submission of the final project. **(15 out of 19, or 78.9%% of students, achieved a final score of 80% of higher on the final Portfolio submission)**

The data for the 3 measures discussed above is presented in the following table.

Cohort	Resume Average	Cover Letter Average	Exam Average (3 per semester)	Portfolio Average	Final Course Grade Distribution
Sp' 15 (n=0)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Sp '16 (n=17)	90%	58%	89.06%	94.47%	A- 10 B-6 C-1
Sp '17 (n-19)	87.26%	90.32%	86.29%	86.58%	A-8 B-11

Follow-up: (How have you used or how will you use the data to improve student learning?)

1. Resume and Cover Letters: As stated above, changes to improve student outcomes for these projects were made between 2016 and 2017. As a whole, the second cohort submitted a higher quality of work; however, the lead instructor identified several areas for improvement. The instructional methods for how to write a resume and cover letter need to be improved, drafts need to be graded with a more detailed rubric and class time for working on the project will again be added to the schedule next year.

2. Exams: Average exam scores decreased 3% from 2016 to 2017; this is likely due to the adopting of a new textbook and revision of course content after the first cohort.

3. Portfolio: The Portfolio project contents, format and requirements will continue to be revised and improved as each cohort completes the project. Changes for the 3rd cohort will include more specific examples of what is required for each section of the portfolio, improved chunking of draft content and the rubrics used to evaluate it, and an emphasis on internalizing the value of the project for professional growth.

4. Weight of Assignments and Grade Distribution: The weight of assignments and exams is reviewed each year to ensure points awarded are distributed appropriately and accurately measure student learning. The program grade scale is currently 75%-79% =C, 80%-89%=B and 90%-100%=A. This is not an even distribution and is artificially inflating grades into the A and

B range. The program grading scale should be evaluated and adjusted for a more even scale which would in turn create a more accurate grade distribution in a Bell Curve with A's, B's and C's.

5. Student Learning Outcomes and Program Competencies: The Learning Outcomes listed on the Master Syllabus need to be reviewed to ensure they are measurable and descriptive of what the course is designed to accomplish.   Additionally, the 7 major program competencies and sub-competencies need to be evaluated and revised for accuracy. This was suggested in the Program Manual Revisions meeting with Drs. Ohl-Giglotti, Weaver and D'Ambrisi in April 2017. Revising the program competencies, outcomes and goals will better align SLOA, curriculum management and accreditation maintenance.

Budget Justification: (What resources are necessary to improve student learning?)
No additional resources are needed at this point. Continued support from HCC to allow students to attend board review activities on and off campus will continue to assist students in successful completion of licensure examinations.